

Therefore, to be consistent among all data sets, all ashes were designated as *Fraxinus* spp. This had the effect of making all stands slightly more similar to one another from a compositional perspective than they would have been otherwise. However, we decided that combining ashes into one entity was preferable to treating the unidentified ashes as a separate species in several data sets, when in fact it might have represented several species. Likewise, all subspecies were converted to its base species, since only the CVS data set had trees identified to subspecies.

The most difficult quality control issue involved never having been in all the stands for which we had data. This was problematic when a potential target stand appeared to be an outlier, since there is no way to determine why this might be so. For example, several stands had no *Acer rubrum* (red maple) in them, which seemed odd because red maple is ubiquitous in forested wetlands. Without actually being at those stands, it was difficult to determine what might have caused an absence of red maple. It could have been that the plot size was so small that it didn't have red maple just by the chance positioning of the plot. In any case, extreme outliers, including a few stands that had red maple, were removed from the data set since they were likely to skew results for no explainable reason.

Restoration stands re-sampled in 2008 were likely identified correctly. Leaves were easily obtained for keying if there were any questions involving identification. In a few cases, there were uncertainties about some oaks that seemed to have been hybrids. These were rare, but they were assigned to the species that they seemed to resemble most.

In summary, we felt that the data we used were fairly accurate, at least accurate enough for our purposes. The data were precise in that they were only based on counts that were then converted to density mathematically. Bias in data collection is impossible to evaluate for previously collected data. It is hoped that any bias potentially introduced in data analysis can be identified by reviewing assumptions and methods.

RESULTS

Of the twenty-six restoration stands initially examined as potential data sets, 11 were chosen that had sufficiently long-term data associated with them (Table 6). Each of these stands was assigned to one of three HGM types, using descriptions gleaned from monitoring reports as a basis for classification: low order riverine, higher order riverine, and wet hardwood flat. Eight of the stands were assigned to wet hardwood flats, one stand was assigned to the low order riparian class, and three stands were assigned to the higher order riparian type. All these restoration sites were re-sampled in 2008, with all tree species (including recruits) identified.

Data from restoration sites originally included several (3-5) years of monitoring, from which survival of planted stems was evaluated. Initial ordinations showed that the composition of restored stands changed little in subsequent years. This was not surprising considering that recruits were not counted during subsequent re-samplings. Because data